

NEW HAMPSHIRE SUPREME COURT - CONCORD

NEW HAMPSHIRE TASK FORCE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
PUBLIC HEARING

MARCH 8, 2022

PUBLIC BRIEFING

APPEARANCES:

Anna Barbara Hantz-Marconi, Chair

Gordon J. MacDonald

Kathy Beebe

Martha Ann Hornick

David Hobbs

Lyn Schollett

Jon Strasburger

Patricia LaFrance

Eric Jasina

Jean Kilham

Anne Zinkin

Sarah Freeman

Elizabeth Payne

Mary Krueger

TRANSCRIPTION COMPANY:

eScribers, LLC

7227 N. 16th Street, Suite 207

Phoenix, AZ 85020

(800) 257-0885

www.escribers.net

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript
produced by court-approved transcription service.



1 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Good morning, everyone. Over
2 the last two months, I have been privileged to chair this Task
3 Force. The Task Force presented its report to the Supreme
4 Court on March 1st, and today we make that report public. The
5 one-week lag was to give the court time to absorb our report.
6 It's a beautiful 40-some pages plus an addendum. We'd like to
7 give you an overview of the report today. The report and the
8 slides I'm using will be uploaded to the website later today.

9 This is a report of this Task Force to the court,
10 not a report of the court. We were brought here because last
11 November, a man shot and seriously injured his female partner
12 and then died by suicide. Although the woman had been granted
13 a temporary order of protection, she did not receive a final
14 order of protection after a hearing, at which she had neither
15 an attorney nor a domestic violence advocate to help her. We
16 still don't know if the man ever knew the temporary order had
17 been lifted.

18 In response to that tragedy and its portrayal in the
19 media, Chf. Justice Gordon MacDonald created an internal
20 committee to review the woman's particular case. That is not
21 this. That committee determined that all procedures and the
22 law were followed, and a reasonable decision was issued by a
23 dedicated and thoughtful judge on the information provided.
24 The case also raised issues such as, why was there no
25 advocate? Why was her petition incomplete and confusing? Why



1 was there no legal counsel at any stage of the proceedings?

2 The members of the Task Force include Crisis Center
3 advocates, prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, court
4 administrators, and others. Many of the Task Force members
5 have worked in the domestic violence field for decades. All
6 members brought unique perspectives, experiences, and skills.
7 Many are with me here today.

8 And let me just identify: Erin Jasina, who's the
9 Domestic Violence program manager at New Hampshire Legal
10 Assistance.

11 Chf. Hobbs in Hampton, the chief of police in
12 Hampton.

13 Jon Strasburger, an attorney, and also who handles
14 defense as well as plaintiff's work in this field.

15 Kathy Beebe, the executive director of HAVEN Crisis
16 Center in the Seacoast.

17 Lyn Schollett, who is the executive director of the
18 Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence.

19 Then we have Dr. Scott Hampton. He is director of
20 Ending the Violence and works with abusers and in the
21 batterer's intervention field.

22 Next to me is Attorney Patricia LaFrance; decades of
23 experience in many different roles in this field.

24 To my left, Marcie Hornick, County Attorney up in
25 Grafton County. Again, lots of experience in this field.



1 We have Jean Kilham, who is the judicial branch's
2 domestic violence program manager.

3 Anne Zinkin, who is our supervisory and senior law
4 clerk at the New Hampshire Supreme Court.

5 Next to her, Sarah Freeman, who used to be the
6 domestic violence program manager for years and is now a
7 circuit court administrator for the circuit court
8 administrator for the branch.

9 Next to her, Elizabeth Payne, senior staff attorney
10 at CASA New Hampshire. And again, plenty of experience in
11 this field.

12 And at the end, Mary Kreuger, staff attorney with
13 New Hampshire Legal Assistance. Last but not least.

14 The Task Force was aided by a five-member working
15 group consisting of professionals from the judicial branch and
16 external stakeholders. That would be Sarah, Jean, Anne, and
17 also Erin. My sincere appreciation to them all. We would not
18 be here without their able assistance. The Supreme Court gave
19 this Task Force seven charges, six substantive, one catch all,
20 whatever else we might come up with.

21 Over a two-month period -- and let me get back on my
22 slides. So here's how we took shape. Here's our list, which
23 you will have available to you. And here are our seven
24 charges, and we'll go through them one by one so you don't
25 have to read that fine print. Over a two-month period, we met



1 remotely to discuss each charge. We held a public hearing in
2 person at the Supreme Court building. The public was also
3 invited to forward comments electronically, by mail, or drop
4 off. We had a toll-free number the public could call to speak
5 directly with a Task Force representative.

6 The Task Force purpose was to identify potential
7 issues with regard to handling domestic violence cases in the
8 judicial systems, not necessarily to resolve those issues.
9 The process of identifying issues and offering potential
10 recommendations was collaborative, yet at the same time,
11 touched upon sensitive issues. It also highlighted some
12 common misunderstandings about the different roles of those
13 responding to domestic violence cases.

14 I applaud the Task Force members for keeping an open
15 mind and hearing concerns that, due to their personal
16 experience or knowledge, they did not share. The hope is that
17 this report and its recommendations are a springboard to
18 action by those working with domestic violence cases in the
19 court system.

20 What follows, is an overview of this Task Force
21 report. In the report, which you will have, you will see that
22 for each charge, we set the stage, giving background to
23 provide context to the discussion. We then offer preliminary
24 recommendations for follow up. We summarized our discussions.
25 And we made those recommendations for follow up by the branch



1 or other entities, agencies, departments who had oversight of
2 that particular area.

3 This today is a high-level review. For more, read
4 the report, and make sure you've got a cup of coffee at your
5 side. It's a lot in there.

6 Charge 1 was a review of current court practices and
7 procedure. For background, the circuit court where domestic
8 violence and stalking cases are predominantly filed, is the
9 State's busiest trial court. They held 138,000 hearings in
10 2020.

11 There were 5,294 domestic violence and civil
12 stalking cases brought in 2020. If there was one hearing per
13 case, that's 5,000 out of 138,000 hearings. If it was a
14 hearing and a half -- some cases have two hearings,
15 preliminary and final -- that would be about 8,000 hearings
16 out of the 138,000 hearings related to this topic. There
17 were, on average, 35 judges sitting in the circuit court in
18 2020. That is 16 hearings a day, every day, five days a week,
19 50 weeks a year, not counting the nonhearing cases on their
20 docket.

21 In 2021, there were 1,000s -- excuse me, 174,000
22 hearings held, despite the pandemic. So that's remote
23 hearings and in person hearings. That would be 20 hearings a
24 day per judge in the circuit court.

25 Since the 1990s, the Branch's processing of domestic



1 violence and stalking cases has been guided by domestic
2 violence protocols, which are currently in the process of
3 being revised yet again. The protocols are, the Task Force
4 determined, comprehensive and effective, but may not be
5 consistently followed. Some protocols risk an appearance of
6 bias, such as a protocol directing -- oh, let me get to
7 these -- directing trial courts to interview a plaintiff if a
8 restraining order is going to be denied, to get more
9 information. That can cause sort of an appearance of the
10 court meddling in the case so to speak.

11 Others, other protocols pre-suppose adequate space
12 at all courthouses. Protocols require a private space for
13 survivors to fill out petitions. And not all of our
14 courthouses have any such space. I'm thinking Claremont. I'm
15 thinking some of the older courthouses. That's a challenge.

16 Current court practices also included and emailed
17 pilot project for petitions to be filed electronically. Right
18 now, domestic violence cases are not part of the e-filing
19 environment because of the sensitive information contained
20 therein. However, during COVID, the circuit court rolled out
21 a pilot program through the crisis centers that allowed
22 petitions to be filed by email. And hopefully, that can
23 continue making access a little bit easier.

24 There are also -- there is also online information
25 and videos directing folks how to file domestic violence



1 petitions. However, I think the consensus is our current
2 efforts aren't sufficient to simplify the process. The Task
3 Force's primary recommendation with regard to court practice
4 is to have established a standing committee on domestic
5 violence, much as the Branch has one on language access, so
6 that the Branch can maintain focus on domestic violence case
7 processing and best practices as things evolve over time.

8 Other recommendations raised by the Task Force
9 include continued work on the protocols, continuing to provide
10 information about crisis centers and safety planning, securing
11 additional funding for judicial and staff training, exploring
12 possible locations for litigants who lack home computers to
13 participate electronically, and there's plenty more in the
14 report. Those are a few.

15 Our second charge was to review the current status
16 of the law. There are five main areas, currently, for relief
17 from domestic violence. The report describes each of these
18 avenues in detail. The Task Force discussions about the law
19 revealed differences of opinion.

20 For example, there was no consensus as to whether
21 the statutory definition of abuse should be amended, nor was
22 there a consensus as to whether new avenues of relief should
23 be created, such as to combat litigation abuse or financial
24 exploitations in domestic situations. Notably, the Judicial
25 Branch does not make policy. It interprets statutes and



1 applies them. Thus, the primary recommendation of the task
2 force was that there should be a group of non-Judicial Branch
3 stakeholders with experience in domestic violence to review
4 existing New Hampshire statutes regarding domestic violence,
5 and if desired, make comprehensive recommendations to the
6 legislature regarding possible statutory changes.

7 I'm trailing myself with my slide.

8 Further recommendations about the law that involve
9 the Branch include continuing to work on a project already
10 begun in the office of mediation regarding domestic violence
11 litigants involved in companioned family law cases, reducing
12 case loads to allow judges and staff more time for
13 professional development and hearing those cases that come
14 before them, establishing a working group to consider the
15 interrelatedness of criminal cases with related civil domestic
16 violence cases occurring in different courts.

17 Our third charge was kind of the easy one, exploring
18 the publication of nonprecedential final orders in domestic
19 violence and stalking cases. Interestingly, of course, this
20 court was not online for many decades because there was no
21 online. In 2004, we began publishing opinions on our website.
22 We also began publishing nonprecedential pre-judge orders on
23 our website, except in confidential cases. Domestic cases
24 aren't confidential, so we were publishing those orders on our
25 website.



1 As of 2014, we began publishing nonprecedential
2 final orders in all of these nonconfidential cases, which
3 included domestic violence and stalking.

4 2018, somebody realized that such publication ran
5 afoul of the Violence Against Women's Act. And although no
6 one had sued us yet, we pulled back and stopped publishing
7 domestic violence and stalking orders on our website. The
8 prohibition in the Violence Against Women Act does not
9 prohibit publicly disseminating the orders, but it does
10 prohibit posting them on the internet. Thus, these orders
11 were available on paper by going to the courthouse, but they
12 were not -- and they were able to be posted on our intranet,
13 but they were not able to be posted on our outward facing
14 internet.

15 That then created a disconnect. So the court had
16 access to nonprecedential orders, which could be relied on to
17 match facts to existing law. The public, unless they came to
18 the courthouse, didn't have easy access to those decisions.
19 So the easy recommendation, which was unanimous, is to find a
20 way to publish these things on our website without running
21 afoul of the Act.

22 That can be done by redacting information that would
23 identify the plaintiff and/or the circumstances of the case.
24 So and that's not a terribly complex issue, but it does
25 involve some review of how many facts can you put in a case



1 until someone can figure who's involved. So we're in the
2 process of doing that, and it should be remedied quite
3 shortly.

4 Our fourth charge was to review current forms. I
5 think there was unanimous or pretty much general consensus
6 that the forms are not as helpful or directive as they could
7 be for people, mostly self-represented folks, filling them
8 out. We now have separate forms for domestic violence cases
9 and stalking orders of protection. They require different
10 information. Domestic violence only applies if you have an
11 intimate partner relationship. Stalking can apply when there
12 is no such relationship.

13 Also, because of statute, all the forms are in
14 English. There are no alternate language forms. It can deal
15 with some pretty clunky translation applications, but we don't
16 have forms readily available in other languages. The forms
17 require certain technical information to comply with the
18 federal uniform database into which they are entered if
19 granted. The forms provide space for lengthy narratives and
20 are not structured to guide plaintiffs to provide the
21 information required to obtain a protective order. It is
22 difficult for plaintiffs to know which form to file.

23 The major recommendation with regard to forms is
24 that the Branch should examine how to make the forms more
25 user-friendly, accessible, and directive, much like the e-



1 filing process has accomplished in other areas, to create a
2 complete and clear petition. Judges report that a
3 comprehensive petition relieves pressure on witnesses at
4 hearings to recall all details and expedites the hearing
5 proves. With a complete comprehensive petition, it leaves few
6 issues for questioning.

7 Also, to expand access in other languages, both on
8 paper and actually in the courthouse. Other recommendations
9 on forms include creating some kind of flowchart to guide
10 plaintiffs onto which kind of petition they should be finding.
11 Our forms need to be more accessible on the website. Right
12 now, it's a little clunky. You got to know which court you're
13 in before you can find the form. The deadline for filing
14 motions to extend needs to be more clearly indicated. And
15 some notifications to defendants would be helpful in the
16 analog or the companion criminal case.

17 Our fifth charge was to explore avenues to increase
18 legal and advocate assistance for survivors. There remains a
19 gap in the needs of modest income New Hampshire residents and
20 the legal services available to them. Despite the efforts of
21 New Hampshire Legal Assistance, 603 Legal Aid's DOVE project,
22 and the Bar Association's modest means and fee programs, there
23 is still a gap. Domestic violence and stalking plaintiffs
24 suffer as a result of this gap.

25 On the advocate side of the ledger, the situation is



1 not much better. There are 12 community-based crisis centers
2 in the State offering free and confidential services,
3 including safety planning. The crisis centers are funded
4 primarily by grants administered by the Coalition, which also
5 provides support services to the centers. AmeriCorp's Victim
6 Assistance Program augments these services with financial
7 literacy efforts. Some, but not all, victim/witness -- some,
8 but not all, police departments have victim/witness advocates.
9 Two words come from this discussion. We need to expand
10 services and deploy them better.

11 This slide represents the gap in service. In 2010,
12 12 years ago, there were 250,000 people eligible for free
13 legal services. That's the whole circle. Of those, 140,000
14 had legal needs annually. That's the dark red and yellow. Of
15 those with legal needs, New Hampshire Legal Assistance was
16 able to offer services to 8,000. That's the yellow.

17 Coming up in 2021, plaintiffs seeking domestic
18 violence protection orders, 87 percent, that's the yellow, are
19 self-represented. 13 percent had counsel. On the second
20 circle, those are civil stalking orders. 95 percent were
21 self-represented. Five percent had counsel.

22 The information required to be conveyed to courts to
23 secure a restraining order is exponentially improved with
24 lawyer representation at the petition drafting stage and in
25 court. Therefore, the answer is more lawyers to take cases on



1 a pro bono basis, and more funding for agencies such as New
2 Hampshire Legal Assistance to hire more attorneys. Optimally,
3 there would be lawyers, volunteer or paid, at courthouses, in
4 crisis centers, or on-call. Remote access to lawyers at
5 hearings could also expand the provision of legal services.
6 Again, expand and deploy.

7 In the meantime, we look at other fill the gap
8 resources. Obviously, crisis centers need more funding, too,
9 so that they can increase staff levels and their volunteer
10 base to have advocates available at courthouses or in real
11 time when needed. Other enhancements include crisis center
12 brochures, making them available at the courthouses. Local
13 police departments being encouraged to add victim/witness
14 advocates, although those advocates have limitations as
15 opposed to crisis center advocates because of the source of
16 their authorities.

17 We were also tasked to look into the state of
18 current relationships among stakeholders. New Hampshire used
19 to be at the forefront of addressing domestic violence in the
20 courts and the community. New Hampshire used to have multiple
21 means of bringing stakeholders together. From the Governor's
22 Commission on Domestic and Sexual Violence, active from 1993
23 to 2013, when it became partially dormant and lacked a chair.
24 The Commission had several robust multi-disciplinary
25 committees. Some of those committees are still active in one



1 form or another. Others are not.

2 We also used to have domestic violence coordinating
3 councils in various regions of the State. The coordinating
4 councils were chaired by a district court judge and brought
5 together court staff, law enforcement, prosecutors, DCYF
6 educators, mental health providers. One coordinating council
7 still meets on a State-wide basis but does not include
8 Judicial Branch members.

9 Due to the court reorganization in 2013 -- excuse
10 me, in 2011, the merger into the circuit court, which removed
11 some of the local contact between district court judges and
12 the community they served when the, I'll say, centralization
13 occurred. Whether it was time pressures, resource pressures,
14 people being diverted to other areas needing attention, this
15 elaborate and formal sort of level of communication dissipated
16 to the point where the Task Force was pretty unanimous that we
17 should make efforts to reconstitute and reestablish those
18 communication networks.

19 Currently, there is a Domestic Violence Program
20 manager in the Branch. That's existed in one form or another
21 for 20 years. And so our Domestic Violence Program manager
22 position does solicit feedback, but that is only one avenue.
23 Participation in the Bar Association's Committee on
24 Cooperation with the Courts is another avenue for
25 collaboration between the courts and the Bar and those working



1 within the courts. That committee could be expanded. Local
2 Bar Association's have these conversations on an ad hoc basis.
3 And the use of these forms of communication are not
4 consistent. So the Task Force agreed we need more and better
5 communication amongst stakeholders and the courts.

6 Hopefully, we can be at the forefront again. Our
7 primary recommendation is that the governor reinvigorate and
8 reestablish the Commission on Domestic Violence and appoint a
9 chair and identify staffing support. Other recommendations
10 include formalizing, now, informal collaborations. Some
11 crisis centers collaborate well with their respective courts.
12 Others have not that same level of communication. And so we'd
13 like to make efforts to formalize those relationships.

14 Okay. Finally -- and I'm getting to finally -- we
15 had a seventh charge, which was anything that the Task Force
16 thought needed attention. And through the Task Force's
17 initiative, we considered issues related to transparency and
18 judicial accountability, firearm relinquishment, wiretapping
19 and eavesdropping, and the batterer's intervention programs.

20 On transparency and accountability, we were most
21 divided on this topic; how to increase the transparency and
22 accountability of the Judicial Branch without sacrificing
23 judicial independence required by New Hampshire's
24 Constitution. Current measures of transparency and
25 accountability include the Judicial Performance Evaluation



1 system, ongoing for nearly 30 years, governed by statute and
2 court rule, that include self-evaluation surveys and
3 interviews by judicial administrators of the judges. Each
4 judge is reviewed on a three-year rotating basis. The results
5 of those reviews as a group are posted to the courts website.

6 The Code of Judicial Conduct governs judicial ethics
7 and is overseen by the Judicial Conduct Committee. Data
8 reports are shared on the Judicial Branch website as to how
9 many cases are handled in various courts. The Task Force
10 agreed that more could be done to demystify the Judicial
11 Branch and make the Branch more transparent and accountable to
12 the public it serves.

13 Some of the ideas were to solicit more immediate
14 feedback from Branch consumers, tasking the Judicial
15 Performance Advisory Committee with reviewing and updating the
16 current Judicial Performance Evaluation system, providing
17 meaningful responses to complaints when able, ask the Judicial
18 Branch's Diversity and Inclusion Steering Committee to look at
19 implicit bias in domestic violence cases. And again, there's
20 plenty more in the report.

21 We also reviewed the current firearm relinquishment
22 process, and we came to the conclusion that this is a
23 complicated topic to which we were unable to devote sufficient
24 time. The slide summarizes our discussions on firearm
25 relinquishment and points to issues related to search and



1 seizure that need to further vetted. Some discussions
2 included whether there should be standardized training,
3 regional task forces, or the Office of the Attorney General
4 looking into and developing best practices.

5 We reviewed the wiretapping and eavesdropping
6 statute. Victims of domestic violence have the burden of
7 proof when they bring petitions for domestic violence or
8 stalking. To support their claims, often a victim will be
9 tempted to record the abuser without his or her knowledge.
10 Currently, this would violate our wiretapping statute.
11 Accordingly, some stakeholders may approach the legislature
12 about creating an exception to the statute for domestic
13 violence survivors.

14 And a fourth area on the initiative of the Task
15 Force was to review the court-approved batterer's intervention
16 programs. The standards are apparently out of date. There is
17 no court-approved list. And there's no mechanism to certify
18 or monitor such program. This was another topic that deserved
19 more attention than the Task Force was able to give it and
20 will involve more than just the Judicial Branch to address
21 perceived gaps in these services.

22 There.

23 So we hope that this report serves as a roadmap for
24 future endeavors of the Judicial Branch and other
25 stakeholders. Some of this can be handled internally by the



1 Branch in short- and long-term. Others, it's going to take
2 some collaboration of various participants in this Task Force
3 and those outside of it.

4 Again, I thank these Task Force members and the
5 public for their participation. This report was provided to
6 the court last week.

7 I would like to bring in our Chief Justice to
8 respond to our report, briefly.

9 CHF. JUSTICE MACDONALD: Thank you. Good morning,
10 everyone, Justice Hantz-Marconi, members of the Task Force.

11 The Supreme Court has prepared a statement that will
12 be issued today, and I wanted to read it:

13 The Task Force on domestic violence cases in the New
14 Hampshire Judicial Branch was created by our order dated
15 December 9th, 2021. We directed it to conduct a systemic
16 review of domestic violence cases in the New Hampshire court
17 system, and to report its conclusions and recommendations in
18 seven categories. This Task Force met its charge. Report
19 sets forth extensive background information, a summary of the
20 information, and testimony received by the Task Force in
21 recommendations in each of the seven categories.

22 The court thanks the members of the Task Force and
23 its chair, Justice Hantz-Marconi, for their exceptional
24 efforts. It is obvious that the report is a result of a great
25 deal of time, effort, and consideration. The court is



1 especially grateful for the collaboration across the wide
2 spectrum of perspectives represented by this Task Force.

3 We've conducted an initial review of the report.
4 Many of its recommendations are directed at the Judicial
5 Branch. Some of those recommendations can be undertaken in
6 the short-term. Others may require more deliberation and
7 planning. And others will require the cooperation of other
8 government officials and stakeholders. We are committed to
9 considering the recommendations and to being transparent about
10 the Judicial Branch's progress.

11 To that end, the court has immediately adopted
12 recommendation 1.1 and has created a Domestic Violence
13 Committee that's a standing committee within the Judicial
14 Branch. It will be chaired by Diane Martin, who is the
15 director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, and will
16 include judges, administrators, and court staff. The
17 Committee will report directly to the Supreme Court. Its
18 initial charge is to catalog of the Task Force
19 recommendations. It will monitor the implementation of those
20 recommendations that have been adopted or approved by the
21 Judicial Branch.

22 New Hampshire has an exceptionally strong trial
23 bench. Our colleagues in both of our trial courts are deeply
24 committed to applying the facts to the law fairly and
25 impartially and to treating all those who come before them



1 with dignity and respect. They are supported by court
2 personnel who are hard-working and highly dedicated in their
3 service to the people of New Hampshire. The circumstances
4 they face can be challenging. Emotions run high. And the
5 volume of cases is significant. In fact, as you heard, across
6 all case types, the circuit court held 174,000 hearings last
7 year.

8 As a judiciary, we are ready to meet the challenges
9 ahead. And if there are opportunities to improve, we will
10 pursue them, thereby making New Hampshire's already strong
11 judiciary even stronger.

12 Thank you very much.

13 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Questions?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, I'm a (indiscernible).

15 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Yes?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How can the Judicial Branch
17 be transparent and held accountable when the Judicial Branch
18 investigates itself?

19 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: In terms of the internal report?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The internal -- well, just in
21 general; the Judicial Review process for judges.

22 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: The -

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's the whole Judicial
24 Branch is what I'm trying to --

25 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: There are two. The --



1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- (Indiscernible) held
2 accountable.

3 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- Judicial Performance Review
4 Committee --

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Um-hum.

6 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- is not simply a Judicial
7 Branch Committee. It includes outside members, members of the
8 legislature, appointees.

9 You might --

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. But according to Court
11 Rules, current Rule 56 --

12 THE COURT: Um-hum.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: -- the Judiciary Evaluation
14 Committee has legislator leaders and really consults with
15 somebody in the Attorney General's Office. There's -- there's
16 a -- it's a wide spectrum of individuals --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: -- not just judges.

19 THE COURT: Not just judges.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: And it's been in existence,
22 the Judicial Performance Evaluation program. It's been in
23 existence, I think, since 1987.

24 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: And those are the reports
25 that -- well, they prepare, they review --



1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

2 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- the surveys, if you will.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's --

4 THE COURT: They're then sent out to the public.
5 They bring them back in, and they review them. And they
6 publish their report annually. It's a comprehensive report.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But why are the judges only
8 reviewed once every three years?

9 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: That was their determination at
10 the time because there's a process. I think we also had the
11 survey guy from UNH on it, too.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: Yeah. And it's also a
13 statute. RSA 490:32. It says that evaluations have to occur
14 at least every three years.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

16 THE COURT: So they --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: And they have to include
18 certain components, including the survey. And so the
19 Committee has partnered with UNH.

20 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Um-hum.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: And initially, partnered
22 with a national organization -- who's name I'm forgetting
23 right now --

24 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Right.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: -- to craft the survey



1 questions.

2 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Right. So that is a committee
3 that puts together the survey as dictated. And then they also
4 review from time to time whether those questions should be
5 updated or revisited. There also is ongoing discussion among
6 that committee whether there should be sort of interim
7 feedback options like we talked about, more immediate. And
8 that's why the recommendation was to ask the Committee to look
9 into more immediate customer-service-type feedback in the
10 courts.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is the -- the surveys -- I
12 mean, the (indiscernible) for surveys barely obscure --

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: Can you move up to the
14 microphone?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, shoot.

16 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Oh.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: We want (indiscernible) can
19 hear you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry.

21 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me.

23 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: That's okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you advertise for these
25 surveys. And you know, it's not through the local paper.



1 It's -- is it the State Bar?

2 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: The surveys, the annual
3 surveys --

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

5 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- are rolled out -- I think
6 they're notified in the State Bar newspaper. They're sent to
7 people who --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who --

9 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- have appeared before that
10 particular judge.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. It's --

12 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: So people who've appeared in
13 court, they get sent --

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It -- it does -- it does not
15 appear to be --

16 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- and then it's also noted on
17 our website, Judicial Branch website --

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

19 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- who is up for review. And
20 there is a survey available on the Judicial Branch 00

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And the -- and the judges who
22 are up for review are notified of this as well?

23 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Right. I think -- well, sure.
24 They would know, yes.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. It -- it - it



1 seems like a fairly close internal role that you -- you've got
2 this review going on. It's not really open. And it's once
3 every three years. And the results, I don't think -- do you
4 publish the results with the names of the judges who've been
5 reviewed and the survey results?

6 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: The comprehensive data is
7 published.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, the --

9 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: But those comments -- I mean,
10 your comments --

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

12 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- would be something directed
13 to the Committee that --

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

15 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- does this.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: Or to the legislature.

17 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Or to the legislature.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: Under 490:32, all the
19 information is deemed confidential.

20 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Yes. And so --

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

22 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- we've got --

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. So. Hm.

24 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: The legislature's deemed it
25 confidential because, again, there are privacy personnel



1 constitutional separation of powers, all that stuff that goes
2 into that --

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I know. But judges are
4 putting people in jail.

5 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- policy.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They're setting this --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: If the judge is evaluated
8 negatively, fails to meet the --

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: -- performance standard two
11 evaluations in a row --

12 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: In a row.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: -- then the -- by statute,
14 it would eliminate your right to privacy and confidentiality.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: And their results are
17 individually recorded in the annual report.

18 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Right.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But -- but when people go
20 before a judge, they don't get two strikes like that to keep
21 it confidential. It's -- it's all out in the open. It's --
22 courts are public. They're -- I mean, they're public for me
23 or -- or anybody else who goes before a judge, but they're not
24 public -- you know, it's not a public transparent process for
25 the judge. There's -- there's a great imbalance here.



1 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Those, I will say because of
2 the -- and all I can say is because of the separation of
3 powers, those are policy considerations that were discussed
4 and determined by the legislature. So it's not something that
5 the Branch has total control over.

6 Again, because of the way our system is, the
7 independence of the judiciary, you can't have -- you can't
8 have independent judicial decision-making if there's a score
9 card every day on every decision. So you balance the
10 independent decision-making, and you balance the need for
11 accountability. And that's what happened in the legislature,
12 and also what is evaluated by the Judicial Review Commission.
13 We certainly have asked them to take a second look, but that's
14 the limit of this Task Force's authority and recommendation.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

16 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Yeah.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was struck by the number of
18 hearings conducted in a year that are just in this arena,
19 domestic violence and stalking. I'm wondering if there's a --
20 if you can give me a sense of how that prepares
21 proportionately to the other legal issues that take up time in
22 the judiciary, in the court?

23 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Well, the 174 is this year -- or
24 let me go back because I don't have the stats for 2021 in
25 domestic violence. So 2020, 138,000, that's the universe of



1 circuit court case hearings.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's all of them?

3 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: That's everything.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: So it's about five to six
5 percent.

6 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Right.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That -- that was my question.

8 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My next question, in -- in
10 the work that the Task Force did on this, was there a glaring
11 weakness in the current system that created an ah-ha moment
12 for you all?

13 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: I don't -- that's interesting.
14 To me, it became -- well, my ah-ha moment was the
15 communication piece. We had a lot more communication
16 previously, when I went back through history, then we did now
17 in terms of -- there was a bit of -- there's a disconnect or a
18 blockage in terms of sharing information where things could be
19 improved, but there wasn't a good response from the Branch or
20 vis versa, or if the Branch hadn't heard of things that could
21 be improved. And so there was a disconnect in the information
22 flow.

23 Otherwise, it seemed, to me -- this is my coming
24 into this. It just seemed to me, to be a series of this could
25 be better, and this could be better, and the forms. Like, we



1 all think -- we're thinking that the forms are
2 straightforward. And I recall back when the family law forms
3 were updated. And to me, there was good, and then it made it
4 more confusing. And so we think the forms are directive, but
5 they're not. And certainly, our experience with online e-
6 filing in other case-types, you end up with something almost
7 like a TurboTax guided interview. If you want this, if you're
8 seeking this, you need to provide this information. That
9 doesn't exist in the domestic violence paper form. It can.
10 Not online, but it can in a paper world. So that, to me, was
11 a big ah-ha moment.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think for -- yeah.

13 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: But I don't know -- yeah.

14 MS. LAFRANCE: I think for me, it always come down
15 to if you break it down to brass tax, it's funding and
16 personnel. There's not enough money. There's not enough
17 people. There's not enough lawyers like me who take
18 volunteer, cases who -- there's not enough advocates that --
19 it always comes down to that. I think this Task Force, the
20 great work it did, that's what it came down to for me, is that
21 we just need more funding, more people to step up and help
22 out, and that's what it comes down to.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So it sounds like the
24 standing committee has been created already. But are there
25 any timelines or deadlines associated with any of these



1 recommendations?

2 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: We've asked. And I suspect my
3 colleagues will allow us to reconvene in six months to take
4 temperature and see what's going on. I know that the chief,
5 from my discussions with him, is going to be expecting routine
6 response from the standing committee, like what have you got
7 on the front burner, what's going to take more time. Some of
8 these are going to take some time. Some of these need funding
9 and some more data collection that we don't currently have the
10 capacity to do because of software and stuff I don't even want
11 to get into.

12 But some are longer term. But some, as we've
13 identified, are sort of easy things we can do, like posting
14 things on the -- we can figure that out. And I think we can
15 probably work on forms in the short-term. So yes. And we
16 hope to get back together -- because I will miss my friends --
17 and get an update in six months.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was struck by the
19 eavesdropping and recording thing that came under the catch
20 all, 7 or whatever.

21 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's fascinating. I can
23 totally see a victim being tempted to record. And -- and up
24 to now, is that rejected by the court? And how actionable
25 is -- yes. Sorry.



1 MS. HORNICK: It is definitely actionable. It's by
2 statute. Certainly, there's some discretion built in there as
3 well. But it was something that caught all of our attention
4 because it comes up in many of these hearings.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So what's the current
6 state --

7 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: And if I can --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- if I -- if I -- if I'm
9 someone being abused, and I record the abuse, and I want to
10 show the court that, is that not allowed right now?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: That, and it's a crime.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So now I've committed a
13 crime?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: Right. I'm not saying --

15 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: And it may be --

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because I didn't get my
17 abuser's consent to hit record?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: I'm not saying necessarily
19 you'll be prosecuted.

20 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Right. Not saying you'll
21 necessarily be prosecuted. But if I can borrow a page from my
22 defense attorney's book, that's something a defense attorney's
23 going to --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Be all over.

25 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: -- raise because it's leverage.



1 And it's perfectly legal (indiscernible).

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: And the --

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And so what's the consensus
4 of this task force? Is this right for legislative action?

5 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: I think, yes.

6 MS. HORNICK: Legislature -- legislative, excuse me,
7 overview. I mean, there are many things just as had been
8 said, that need to be looked at -- the legislature needs to
9 look at because they are the ones that control, obviously,
10 this --

11 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Policy.

12 MS. HORNICK: -- language.

13 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Yeah, and there could be
14 unintended --

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: New Hampshire's 1 in 11
16 states --

17 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Right.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: New Hampshire is 1 of 11
19 states where both parties to the communication to have
20 consent. So that might be something the legislature might
21 want to look at.

22 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Right. But there can be
23 unintended consequences -- not speaking for the legislature --
24 of this carveout exception, how that gets utilized in maybe
25 other situations. So they have to do -- that's what they do,



1 right? They balance policy.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think as a member of the
3 public, you hear all of this. You got to take a look at this.
4 You got to do another committee.

5 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Right.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All of that sounds very
7 bureaucratic. And I'm just wondering --

8 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- what is the most urgent
10 action item coming out of the body of work that you did over
11 the past two months?

12 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: What do we think the most urgent
13 thing is? They are all pieces to a puzzle, I think is how it
14 came to me. The firearm thing, that can be urgent in a
15 certain situation, what the limitations are on law enforcement
16 in retrieving firearms and search warrants. And again,
17 bureaucracy, red tape, clarifying that, very important.

18 Clarifying the accountability side because there
19 is -- I mean, to me, that's important because there is, I will
20 say, some level of lack of understanding the limits of what
21 judges can do and what they can't do. Whether judges can
22 reinterpret the law without a case before them that will allow
23 them to do so. So sort of messaging what it is the judge can
24 do in a certain situation, what law enforcement can do in a
25 certain situation. I think that, to me, is critical.



1 MS. LAFRANCE: I think, also, the more assistance,
2 particularly for pro se plaintiffs who go before the court,
3 you want to make sure that they're presenting the best case
4 they have to that judge as to why they need these restraining
5 orders. So when we're not doing that, when that plaintiff
6 goes before, and they forget to include something, that, to
7 me, is a travesty of justice because they did not put their
8 best case forward. They did not give everything they had.

9 So it's frustrating as an attorney. I get a client
10 after the fact, and I say, why didn't you tell them this? I
11 don't know. I didn't think it was -- ugh. You know? It's
12 very frustrating. So I think direct assistance to those pro
13 se litigants is important.

14 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Yeah. That's a big one because
15 judges agree. If they get -- in fact, one of the judges on
16 the task force said if she gets a fully filled out
17 comprehensive petition, all she has to do is say to the
18 plaintiff is everything in here true? Yes. That presentation
19 is over.

20 Instead of having an extremely stressed,
21 unrepresented person trying to remember and fit the facts into
22 the form of what the judge needs to issue an order. That's an
23 impossible task. If you had legal counsel available to fill
24 out that form with everything that the law requires, it makes
25 it a lot simpler. You'll still have cross-examination and all



1 that, but at least you've got the base facts there.

2 We also discussed some burden-shifting ideas.

3 Again, that would they need legislative tweaking. But there's
4 a lot we can do right away if we can get those petitions
5 firmed up.

6 DR. HAMPTON: I just wanted to add, in terms of what
7 seems to be more pressing, sort of taking a step back, I think
8 the most pressing thing was reestablishing these
9 cross-discipline conversations. Because I think what -- with
10 the work that I do with offenders, I notice that abuse thrives
11 whenever they're disconnected between the different people
12 doing the work. We all have different professional
13 obligations and different perspectives. And when there's --
14 and there are little gaps of abuse that slivers right through
15 those.

16 And so one of the questions I think is important for
17 all of us when we're trying to address abuse is, whatever
18 we're doing, whatever conversation, whatever convention,
19 whatever law we're passing, whatever we're doing, does that
20 increase or decrease an abuser's inclination to not continue
21 to abuse. And if the answer is yes, it increases it, then we
22 have to step back and say how can we tighten the system?

23 And we notice that there were a lot of conversation
24 that had fallen by the wayside over the last several years.
25 And I the energy that I saw in this Task Force and the



1 interest in reinvigorating our work is what makes me most
2 hopeful that we can move it forward.

3 MS. HORNICK: And also, I think it boils down to
4 protecting people, safety of others. I mean, that's what,
5 really, I think, generated a lot of passion from the
6 (indiscernible).

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could I just ask one more
8 question?

9 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Yeah.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I could go all day. But I --
11 I wanted to ask the question about the tool of a restraining
12 order. Are there -- it just seems like that tool is full of
13 holes. And I -- I just wonder -- I don't -- I don't know what
14 I wonder.

15 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Part of what I learned, and
16 certainly from my crisis center colleagues, that is just one
17 tool. There's a whole bucket, if you will, of safety planning
18 that goes with services to domestic violence survivors. So
19 whether the tools is there or not, sometimes -- and I've
20 learned, there might be a criminal case pending, and the
21 victim doesn't want to bring a violence petition. In those --
22 for many reasons. There can be all kinds of reasons, kids,
23 money, you name it, fear.

24 In those circumstances, the safety planning piece is
25 what can be done outside of that piece of paper, that



1 restraining order. And sometimes, if the -- if the instances
2 don't quite fit, there might not be that piece of paper. But
3 again, the safety planning piece, how they access resources,
4 how they get housing, how they keep themselves and their kids
5 safe, that's a whole, equally important level of service that
6 comes into this space.

7 The court is only -- and I used to do a bunch of
8 family law back in the day. And sometimes, the court can only
9 go so far in deciding who gets the kids on Christmas Day. But
10 there's a whole other piece of how you manage a broken family,
11 and in this instance, how you manage potential danger, that
12 goes into the equation. So yes, there are statistics. We
13 don't have them in our State. There's some national
14 statistics on how effective is that restraining order tool.
15 And that might be something, with a little more data, we could
16 look at deeper here.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because it seems like it's
18 overweighted, maybe because it's in the -- in the media and in
19 the shows we watch. And it seems like a one tool I can get,
20 and then I'm going to have this forcefield of protection. But
21 we talk about cases where the perpetrator didn't even know
22 there was a restraining order, or the victim tried to get one,
23 didn't get one, or the victim gets one, and that insights rage
24 in the abuser, and -- and now you've escalated the violence
25 against the person who is seeking the forcefield. It just



1 seems --

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: I just want to say that an
3 order of protection is one small piece of a (indiscernible).
4 And that may keep an individual survivor safe. But that's why
5 we have crisis center avenues for. They are experts on scene,
6 and they can help someone create a safety plan that works for
7 their particular circumstances. Another reason why it's so
8 vital that those services are available for our survivors.

9 The protection order is one small piece, and it's in
10 the system. And it doesn't work for everybody. And the legal
11 (indiscernible) part, that's created (indiscernible). I think
12 it was clear in this Task Force that there needs to be these
13 cross-disciplinary conversations so that there are rules for
14 domestic violence survivors, whether it's in the process of
15 (indiscernible).

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So right now, in New
17 Hampshire, if you obtain -- does a restraining order come with
18 a package deal of the -- of the supportive safety services for
19 the person? It's not a package deal.

20 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Actually, the -- any referral to
21 the crisis center comes at the petition filing stage. So
22 whether or not the person gets a restraining order, they can
23 be hooked up with a crisis center.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

25 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: And so we try, from the court



1 system, to refer people. We can be better at that, getting
2 people with connected with crisis centers. Some people -- and
3 this is one thing we discussed that we need to perhaps
4 involve -- it needs another discussion.

5 But we need to involve 603 Legal with -- that's our
6 legal services revamped organization. They have a phone
7 contact, and they have a domestic violence person,
8 lawyer/staff attorney, at the end of the phone to talk to
9 people who -- this will sound funny, but some people don't
10 want to go to a crisis center because they think they'll be
11 talked into filing a domestic violence petition. They don't
12 want to be forced, or they think that that could put them
13 in -- someone might find out. If they could make a private
14 phone call to another number and get those considerations
15 addressed, they can be rerouted to the crisis centers.

16 But there are some people who sort of fall through
17 that referral network. But they have that opportunity right
18 up front. And then, hopefully, we can marry up the crisis
19 center safety planning with some legal assistance with filling
20 out petitions before they even go to court. Then, depending
21 on what happens at court, get the order, don't get the order,
22 there's still additional services available. They don't have
23 to be referred in the way that kids refer for services. The
24 crisis centers are independent, separately funded, not part of
25 the court. And they take all comers.



1 MS: SCHOLLETT: Restraining orders are really a
2 microcosm of the comprehensive work that this Task Force did.
3 They will be most effective when every discipline you see
4 seated here is actively engaged and privy in the system.
5 Whether that's the forms, whether that's access to the courts,
6 transparency, attorneys, advocates. They are one important
7 tool, but we need everyone here. We need our law enforcement
8 departments to be engaged.

9 A restraining order will work when a victim's school
10 knows of that, when the victim's employer knows about it, and
11 the people in the victim's community know about it, when the
12 firearm (indiscernible) components work. So they are
13 critical -- excuse me. They are a critical, critical tool.
14 But it is absolutely necessary to have all of the entities
15 that you see here today involved in the enforcement.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I wanted to ask about sort of
18 how survivors with children factor into this? Just because I
19 remember that was a -- a big component of the testimony at the
20 public hearing, was kind of custody issues, and how that
21 intersected with domestic violence in the courts. So I was
22 wondering if there were particular recommendations that might
23 address some of those issues that were raised, or if it's kind
24 of -- just sort of, how -- how children factor into some of
25 these issues?



1 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: We identified some sort of
2 critical flashpoints, if you will. There's the domestic
3 violence case. There's the related family law case. Now,
4 you've got to discuss -- you've got to share financial
5 information. You've got to share a lot of personal
6 information. And you've got to discuss and deal with
7 parenting the children. Domestic violence against the partner
8 doesn't necessarily translate to a complete prohibition on
9 contact between the abuser parent and the child.

10 So those are all things that get weighed in the
11 court system. Also, there's another flashpoint with
12 mediation. There's a big push for mediation in family law
13 cases. How do you do that when there's a restraining order in
14 place, and the victim doesn't want to be face-to-face with
15 their abuser? I mean, who would want to be? So there is a
16 program in our office of mediation within the Branch, along
17 with the Women's --

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: Battered Women's Justice
19 Project.

20 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: Thank you.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: Providing consultation to
22 our Office of Mediation Arbitration to look at that. That
23 deals with family cases and domestic violence cases, because
24 internally, those are two separate case files. But when an
25 individual is involved, it is one family, one unit. So that



1 (indiscernible) having to be the court's perspective of two
2 piece (indiscernible) when the family is maybe a struggle that
3 we look at and we work through. And we acknowledge this and
4 (indiscernible).

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: And so is that reflected in
6 these recommendations somewhere, or --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: Yes. So the recommendation
8 is that the work that was started -- I think in 2018, is that
9 right? To continue. And I think that it was a funding issue.
10 So to have the funding be sought out so that that work
11 continued. I think that there were surveys. There was focus
12 groups. There was a tremendous amount of work done with the
13 Battered Women's Justice Project and the Office of Mediation
14 and our committee. So it's just continuing that work.

15 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: And then perhaps -- I'll speak
16 out of turn, but maybe the protocols can -- it'll dovetail
17 with the protocols, and we can have some that give a little
18 more guidance on how to do deal with those issues. Because
19 these things -- again, my experience listening to everyone,
20 these things all arise from different start points. And it's
21 been a process of pulling it all sort of together and
22 coordinating.

23 There's services in the criminal side with the
24 victim advocates, victim/witness advocates. But then that
25 stops at the border of the criminal case. And you have the



1 family law case, which has those considerations, which stop at
2 the border of the family law case. So there really needs to
3 be a coordination. Yeah.

4 Anything else? All right. I'm getting the thumbs
5 up from my colleague in the back.

6 I just want to thank all of you. This has been an
7 honor and a pleasure. And thank you for being here today.
8 And thank you. Okay.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

10 MS. HANTZ-MARCONI: School's out.

11 (Proceedings concluded at 5:51 p.m.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



CERTIFICATE

I, Samantha Stewart, a court-approved proofreader, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, to the best of my professional skills and abilities.

TRANSCRIPTIONIST(S): Amanda J. Orlando, CDLT-260

Samantha
Stewart

Digitally signed by
Samantha Stewart
Date: 2022.09.19
22:26:50 -04'00'

SAMANTHA STEWART, CDLT-253
Proofreader

September 12, 2022

